

### REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated July 11, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to the points of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, entry of the Amendment and favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 are pending. Claim 11 is cancelled. Claims 1-7, 9, 12, 14, 16 and 17 are amended above. No new matter has been introduced by the Amendments.

Claims 1 and 6-10 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over EP 0526057 (Schilling). Claims 1, 7 and 11-17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Schilling, in view of GB 1324898 (Monsanto). Applicants respectfully submit the following remarks in support of the patentability of the claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include an additional recitation of original Claim 11, now cancelled. Amended Claim 1 is directed to a fan blade and recites a plurality of fiber composite layers and a plurality of high elongation fiber composite strips joining one of the fiber composite layers at a joint. The high elongation fiber composite strips include a first high elongation fiber composite strip having fibers oriented in a first direction and a second high elongation fiber composite strip having fibers oriented in a second direction different than the first direction.

As noted by the Examiner, Schilling does not disclose a first high elongation fiber composite strip having fibers oriented in a first direction and a second high elongation fiber composite strip having fibers oriented in a second direction different than the first direction, as recited by Claim 1. Monsanto does not supply this recitation. Monsanto is directed to a graphite-fiber-reinforced laminate. The discussion in Monsanto cited by the Examiner is directed to the positioning of the graphite fiber layer relative to the elastic layers. Further, Monsanto expressly teaches that it is preferable that the elastic fiber ply or plies contiguous to the graphite fiber layer have approximately the same orientation as the adjacent graphite fiber. (Col. 3, lines 26-34) Although Monsanto appears to include examples with different fiber orientations (Table 1), Applicants respectfully submit that if one skilled in the art were to modify Schilling based on Monsanto, then one skilled in the

art would not combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner, as this contradicts the express teaching of Monsanto that at the elastic fiber-graphite fiber interfaces, it is preferable that the fibers should have the same orientation.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art, either alone or in combination. As Claims 2-10 and 12-17 depend from claim 1, these arguments apply with equal force to Claims 2-10 and 12-17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 1 and 6-10 under 35 USC 102(b) be withdrawn. Applicants further respectfully request that the rejections of 1, 7 and 11-17 under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims, namely Claims 1-10 and 12-17, are in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

**Please charge all applicable fees associated with the submittal of this Amendment and any other fees applicable to this application to the Assignee's Deposit Account No. 07-0868.**

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Penny A. Clarke/  
Penny A. Clarke  
Reg. No. 46,627

General Electric Company  
Building K1, Room 3A72  
Niskayuna, New York 12309  
September 11, 2007  
Telephone: (518) 387-5349